



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

do not often find a person alluding to a word being used by others and new to him.

'dringen' in IV 125 might perhaps deserve a note.

The words IV 139,

'Meinem Vaterland hilfreich zu sein und schrecklich den Feinden'

are apt to be connected by students with the verb 'ruft' in l. 137 and not with 'der hohe Gedanke,' to which they belong.

I should not be just to Prof. Hatfield's valuable notes if I did not mention that they give also, from canto to canto, suggestions in regard to the development of the plot as well as the characterization of the persons.

The whole edition is a credit to Prof. Hatfield's sound scholarship and fine aesthetic taste; it is also extremely creditable to the publishers and the printer. The paper is strong, the type is clear; a frontispiece in form of a cut of the Trippel bust of Goethe enhances the outward appearance.

E. LESER.

BLOOMINGTON, IND.

Julius E. Olson: *Norwegian Grammar and Reader, with notes and vocabulary.* Chicago, 1898.

It might appear somewhat presumptuous on the part of one who himself is the author of a Danish and Norwegian grammar for English-speaking students to review a competitor's work. I shall, however, try to proceed *sine ira et studio* and I desire at once to premise that I consider the book as a whole well adapted for the purpose which the author has in view. I cannot, however, deny that there are a good many things in the book with which I cannot agree and I shall briefly state my objections.

The author in his preface says: 'I have seen fit to call this work a Norwegian Grammar and Reader instead of using the cumbersome and awkward term 'Dano-Norwegian.' The author in this respect is at variance with all modern scientific Norwegian authors, among whom it becomes more and more the exclusive fashion to distinguish between 'Dano-Norwegian,' i. e. the educated Norwegian city and written language, and 'Norwegian' meaning the relatively untainted country

language, whether it be 'landsmaal' or dialects. Facts are not altered by changing names, and it is better to use a correct name, even though it be awkward, than one which does not convey the right idea.

The author, in giving his sources of information, acknowledges his obligations to Hofgaard's *Norsk Grammatik* and Poestion's *Lehrbuch der Norwegischen Sprache*. It is rather a limited literature upon which to base a grammar, and we might particularly have expected that Mikkelsen's Danish Grammar, even though it be 'Danish,' had been made use of; the more so, as Professor Olson's book in some places gives account of Danish peculiarities in contradistinction from Norwegian ones.

The author is only half right when he says (Rule 2) that the official orthography of Norway and Denmark, as at present taught in the public schools, uses capital letters only at the beginning of a sentence, etc. The official Danish rules of spelling still demand capital letters in nouns and other words used as substantives. If that were not so, there would be absolutely no reason for the author to retain the capital letters in nouns, as he does in the Grammar and Reader.

While the author is decidedly right (4) about the pouting of the lips in pronouncing rounded vowels, I think he is absolutely wrong about the 'decided chinking' or spreading out of the corners of the mouth in producing the unrounded *i*, *e* and *æ*. Upon the whole it seems to me that the author's treatment of the Norwegian sounds is rather scanty, but as our difference of opinion and treatment probably here is one of principle, I shall not enter upon a discussion of the matter.

19, b. 'Where the *t* is added to these endings,—i. e. *ig* and *lig*—(to form the neuter) the *g* has a *k* sound.'—This would be correct, if the ending really were heard. But neither *g* nor *t* are in that case pronounced. *Merkeligt* and *merkelig* are both pronounced *merkeli*.

22. The description of the peculiar Norwegian *kj* sound ('approximately the sound of *ch* in church') seems very unsatisfactory. In his preface the author indicates it as one of the objects of the book 'to serve as a guide to that increasingly large number of persons of Norwegian parentage, who, having some knowledge of the spoken Norwegian, desire to

know something about Norwegian literature.' A direction like the one above will strengthen that class of readers in their faulty ways instead of guiding them on the right path, because one of the chief faults in the speech of persons of Norwegian parentage in this country is their pronouncing *kj* 'approximately like *ch*.'

The author's whole position with reference to phonetics is more clearly, than it could be done by a lengthy critical statement, set forth in the following sentence in 32 A :

'These changes (i. e. the umlaut) were originally produced by a process of assimilation effected by the appearance of certain letters (or sounds) in the inflectional endings of words.'

The rules relating to the gender of the nouns seem to me to be very unfortunately worded. '37. Nouns have two genders, common and neuter. This (what?) is indicated in the singular by the articles, and also by the adjectives and pronouns.' One would think that the articles, adjectives and pronouns only existed in order to indicate 'this' (probably meaning the gender of the noun).

38. 'The grammatical gender of a noun is often determined by the natural gender, but usually by its ending.' Is it not now about time to be done with the expression, 'the gender determined by the ending'?

43. 'Grevinde, countess, from Grev, count.' The word is Greve, when used alone; Grev is only used as a title in connection with the name.

47, 4, c. 'Foreign words ending in *um* drop this termination when they receive the plural or definite ending; as *et Studium, Studier*.' That is right enough. But *et Album* has not the plural Alber, but Albums or Albumer.

Some of the Norwegian examples used in the grammar seem to indicate that the author to a certain extent has lost touch with his native language. Thus no Norwegian would take '*et vantro Menneske*' (55) to mean an incredulous person, but an infidel, and no Norwegian would say (55 B) '*en virksom Lærer*' for an active teacher, but '*en energisk Lærer*.'

The author mixes the adjectives and the pronouns up in an absolutely unnecessary manner. Thus we have 'den, det, de' in 59 as demonstrative adjectives, in 70 as personal pronouns and in 74 as demonstrative pronouns. And I must confess that I

fail to see the difference between 'disse' as adjective in '*disse Bøger er ikke dine*' (59) and as pronoun in '*begge disse Veie fører til Byen*' (74, A). And it cannot truthfully be said: 60 'The following words are also used both adjectively and substantively' when among those words are mentioned '*saadan*' and '*slig*' (both meaning 'such'). Neither of these words can be used substantively in the common gender singular, just as little as any other adjective without the article. Different from what was the case with the demonstratives and indefinite pronouns, the author (63) says: 'The possessives might properly be treated under adjectives, but being derived from pronouns they are more readily understood after these have been studied, and for that reason they will be given under Pronouns.'

It is wrong to say (69 A) that we in *tildøde* have a remnant of an old dative. *Til* in the old language could only govern genitive, and that is what we have here, *tildøde* representing an old *til dauða* (genitive, nom. *dauði*). A couple of examples given in 76 (page 37) are objectionable from a linguistic point of view. We do not say in Norwegian: '*Hvorledes fandt De Deres Vei?*', How did you find your way? nor '*Hvorledes fandt de sin Vei?*', How did they find their way? We say: '*Hvorledes fandt De (de) Veien?*' '*Hvorledes fandt De Deres Vei?*' can only mean: How (i. e. in what condition) did you find your road (meaning the road on your property, or the road that you had built). Nor do we say: *Han kan ikke tjene Brød til sine Børn*, he cannot earn bread for his children, but *han kan ikke tjene Føden til sine Børn*.

77. It is misleading to say: '*Hvilken* and *hvad for en* are also used adjectively', because that is their primary use.

77 and 78. It is well enough to be systematic but systematizing can be overdone, and that is what I think the author has been guilty of in making up the paradigms for the declension of the interrogative and relative pronouns.

The following may be a small matter, but still there is reason to protest against the author's mechanical way of looking at language, when he says (93 A): '*Nogen*, in the plural, is usually rendered by 'any', and *nogle* by 'some', as if the 'rendering' were something arbitrary, that was not based on an essential difference in linguistic usage.

103. 'In colloquial language *andre*, although a plural form, is frequently used instead of *anden* and *andet*.' It would, indeed, be strange if the language should all of a sudden commence to use the plural as singular. *Den andre, det andre* are definite forms, formed analogously with the definite form of the adjectives, on the basis of the thematic form shown by the plural.

103 d. '*Jeg har seet ham kun en Gang*', I have seen him but once, in Norwegian ought to be: '*Jeg har kun (or bare) seet ham en Gang.*'

116. 7. Note: 'The strong conjugation is the oldest, and was undoubtedly for a time the only one. But at an early period some verbs were given a weak conjugation and at present perhaps nine-tenths of all Dano-Norwegian (why this cumbersome and awkward expression?) verbs are weak,' etc. The author is here moving in such mystic blue regions of historical grammar that he might well have kept away from them in a book of this kind.

In a grammar of the short compass of the present book there ought to be no superfluous verbiage. But what is said in 127 as an introduction to the treatment of the passive voice is entirely unnecessary, if nothing worse: 'What has been said in regard to mood and tense indicates that the Active Voice in Norwegian Grammar is like that of English. The Passive Voice, however, is somewhat different.' What does it mean? Could a boy take a paradigm of the active voice of an English verb and apply it to Norwegian?

139. '*Han vilde netop reise*,—he was just on the point of going.' Un-Norwegian. *Han stod netop i Begreb med (or var færdig til or skulde til) at reise.*

145. *Mon (or monne)*. 'These forms are remnants of the old Norse verb *muna*, to remember.' A bad blunder. These forms correspond to the Old Norse verb *munu*, which is a modal auxiliary, will or shall, may.

The selections accepted into the reader are, upon the whole, very good. A few pieces, e. g. one of those by Collin, and those by Hilditch and Henrik Jäger, might perhaps better have been replaced by real literature. If we compare this reader with the former Norwegian reader produced in America, that contained in Peterson's grammar, there is certainly a vast improvement; but that was positively bad.

Without having had time to examine the notes in detail I have the impression that they are very good. I notice, however, a few things that are not quite correct.

It can e. g. hardly be maintained, nowadays, that the best version of Olaf Tryggvason's Saga is that contained in the Flateyjar bok (p. 259). If by best is meant best looking from a writing artist's point of view, then I agree. '*Selv femtende, himself the fifteenth,*' i. e. himself and fourteen others, is not a common turn of phrase in Old Norse, but in modern Danish and Norwegian. Old Norse has another phrase to express the same meaning. Why (page 260) 'Tryggvason' ought to be spelled with ss to be consistent with the other names in this reader, I do not see. Sturlasson is to a certain extent correctly spelt with ss, because the nominative is Sturla, which now can be given the Gen. Sturlas instead of the old Sturlu; but the nominative of Tryggva is Tryggvi, and by spelling the name Tryggvasson, it is given a double genitive form.

Page 263. '*Den som, unhappy be who or think of him who, a very common elliptical phrase.*' Hardly correct. In the first place there is no room here for an ellipsis, because *den* is simply subject of the sentence '*kjender sig mindre Aar for Aar.*' Besides, the elliptical use of '*den, som*' etc., 'he who' is to the best of my knowledge limited to wishes, '*Aa, den som en Stund fik ønske sig hjem!*'

P. 270 (and 212). The Norwegian spelling and pronunciation is Haavamaal, not Havamal. This name is on page 270 explained as the 'High One's (i. e. Odin's) Lay' and on page 279 as 'the High One's Speech.'

Page 282. '*Stiklestad, a battlefield in eastern Norway.*' A rather loose description. In Norway the qualifications eastern and western are only applied to the eastern and western parts of that part of the country which is 'south of the mountains,' i. e. of the Dovre mountain ridge. The northern part of the country, that which is 'north of the mountains' is mostly so narrow that there is no opportunity of speaking about eastern or western. The correct thing would have been to say: 'in northern Norway,' or 'near Throndhjem.'

I conclude by stating that Professor Olson's grammar, as I said at the beginning, in spite of those faults which I have pointed out, will, upon the whole, be found suitable for its purpose, and the reader and the notes are very serviceable.

P. GROTH.